

Remarks/Arguments:

Amendments

Support for the amendment to claim 1 and to claim 9 is found on page 3, lines 6-9, and on page 7, lines 1-3. Support for newly presented claims 17 and 18 is found in Example 1, page 4, lines 20-23. It is submitted that no new matter is introduced by these amendments and new claims.

Rejection under 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by JP 10-218675.

Claims 1 and 9, the independent claims, have been amended to recite that the multi-layered ceramic substrate comprises at least one cavity and that the shrinkage suppression sheet covers the at least one cavity. This limitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by JP 10-218675. Note that the Figure shows that the ceramic substrate 11 is flat and smooth.

In applicants' invention, the ceramic material that forms the shrinkage suppression sheet fills the at least one cavity, and the ceramic powder and water must also remove the ceramic material in the at least one cavity. JP 10-218675 teaches that the disclosed process provides a flat surface for the ceramic board. See, ¶¶ 4 and 31. Thus, the person of ordinary skill in the art, having the advantage of the teachings of JP 10-218675, would not be motivated to attempt to use the process of JP 10-218675 to remove a ceramic layer from a ceramic board having a cavity because JP 10-218675 teaches that the process produces a flat surface.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, and 16 are patentable over the disclosure of JP 10-218675 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

Claims 7, 8, and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over JP 10-218675 in view of Yam, U.S. Patent 5,827,114 ("Yam").

As discussed above, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the multi-layered ceramic substrate has at least one cavity and that the shrinkage suppression sheet

covers the at least one cavity. Thus, the person of ordinary skill in the art, having the advantage of the teachings of JP 10-218675 would not be motivated to attempt to use the process of JP 10-218675 to remove a ceramic layer from a ceramic board having a cavity because JP 10-218675 teaches that the process produces a flat surface. Nothing in Yam discloses or suggests using the process of JP 10-218675 to remove a ceramic layer from a ceramic board having a cavity. Thus, the combination of JP 10-218675 and Yam does not produce applicants' invention.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 7, 8, and 15 are patentable over the combination of the disclosures of JP 10-218675 and Yam, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to phone applicants' attorney if it is believed that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Bruce M. Monroe, Reg. No. 33,602
Attorneys for Applicants

LEA/vj

Dated: August 14, 2003

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on.